

APPENDIX G
SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G - 1

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

The following contains the schedule of compensation filed with the Revisor of Statutes by the Missouri Citizen's Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials as required by the Missouri State Constitution, Article XIII.

November 27, 2000

The Honorable Rebecca McDowell Cook
Secretary of State
600 West Main
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Donald Prost
Revisor of Statutes
Committee on Legislative Research
Room 117-A
State Capitol
Jefferson City, Missouri

Dear Secretary of State Cook and Mr. Prost:

Article XIII, Section 3 of the Missouri Constitution requires that the Missouri Citizen's Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials file a report before December 1. The Commission's report is attached and contains the schedule of compensation required.

Sincerely,

John Ebeling
Chairman

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

MISSOURI CITIZEN'S COMMISSION ON COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS COMPENSATION SCHEDULE


	FY 2001 Actual	5.5% Salary Adjustment	Base	Leadership Adjustments	FY 2002 Compensation	FY 2002 Base	5.5% Salary Adjustment	Leadership Differential	FY 2003 Compensation
Statewide elected officials									
Governor	119,982	6,599	0	0	126,581	126,581	6,962	0	133,543
LT Governor	77,079	4,239	0	0	81,316	81,316	4,472	0	85,790
Secretary of State	98,350	5,299	0	0	103,649	103,649	5,591	0	109,240
Attorney General	104,227	5,732	0	0	109,959	109,959	6,046	0	116,007
Treasurer	98,350	5,299	0	0	103,649	103,649	5,591	0	109,240
Auditor	98,350	5,299	0	0	103,649	103,649	5,591	0	109,240
General Assembly									
Senator	31,246	1,719	0	0	32,965	32,965	1,813	0	34,778
Representative	31,246	1,719	0	0	32,965	32,965	1,813	0	34,778
Speaker of the House	31,246	1,719	0	2,500	35,465	35,465	1,813	3,000	37,778
President Pro Tem of the Senate	31,246	1,719	0	2,500	35,465	35,465	1,813	3,000	37,778
Speaker Pro Tem of the House	31,246	1,719	0	1,500	34,465	34,465	1,813	2,000	36,778
Majority Floor Leader of the Senate	31,246	1,719	0	1,500	34,465	34,465	1,813	2,000	36,778
Minority Floor Leader of the House	31,246	1,719	0	1,500	34,465	34,465	1,813	2,000	36,778
Minority Floor Leader of the Senate	31,246	1,719	0	1,500	34,465	34,465	1,813	2,000	36,778
Minority Floor Leader of the House	31,246	1,719	0	1,500	34,465	34,465	1,813	2,000	36,778
Judiciary									
Supreme Court - Chief Justice	123,000	6,765	0	2,500	132,265	129,765	7,137	2,500	139,402
Supreme Court	123,000	6,765	0	0	129,765	129,765	7,137	0	136,902
Court of Appeals Judge	115,000	6,325	0	0	121,325	121,325	6,573	0	127,898
Circuit Court Judge	108,000	5,940	0	0	113,940	113,940	6,257	0	120,207
Associate Circuit Court Judge	95,000	5,280	1,000	0	102,280	102,280	5,625	0	107,905

Per diem is to be increased at 60 percent of the federal per diem in Jefferson City.

Mileage for all positions is to be increased to the prevailing State of Missouri - Office of Administration rate.

APPENDIX G
SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G-3



Report of the
Missouri Citizens' Commission
on Compensation
for Elected Officials

November 2002

APPENDIX G
SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION



Missouri Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials

November 27, 2002


The Honorable Matt Blunt
Secretary of State
600 West Main
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Patricia L. Buxton
Revisor of Statutes
Committee on Legislative Research
Room 117-A
State Capitol
Jefferson City, Missouri

Dear Secretary of State Blunt and Ms. Buxton:

Article XIII, Section 3 of the Missouri Constitution requires that the Missouri Citizen's Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials file a report before December 1. The Commission's report is attached and contains the schedule of compensation required.

Sincerely,


John F. Ebeling
Chairman

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G - 5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Statewide elected officials and General Assembly

- 5.8 percent increase for both Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005 using the pay plan model developed for the rest of state government employees by the state's Personnel Advisory Board and the Missouri Commission on Total Compensation.
 - 3.8 percent for a general structure adjustment.
 - 2.0 percent equivalent to one within grade step.
- The Commission believes that statewide elected officials and the General Assembly should be granted the same salary increases as other state employees receive. The Commission urges the Governor and General Assembly to provide a salary increase in Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005 for state employees. In addition, the Commission urges the Governor and the General Assembly to provide funding to deal with increased health care costs so that state employees do not suffer net pay decreases in the future.
- The Commission's compensation schedule is not intended to be added on top of any other general, uniform increase given to other state employees. Nor does the Commission intend that any general, uniform increase be added on top of the compensation schedule.

Judiciary

- \$6,000 base increase each year for all levels of the judiciary.

Future of the Commission

- The members recommend that if the General Assembly does not fund in whole, or in part, the recommendations of the Commission that a constitutional amendment should be submitted to the voters in August 2004 to either:
 - a. Change the structure of the Commission so that the recommendations are binding upon the General Assembly and stand appropriated, or
 - b. Abolish the Commission.
- The recommendations of the Commission were ignored and criticized in 1996, 1998, and 2000. Members of the Commission recognize that this year's recommendations may receive the same fate. If that is the case then it is clear that the current constitutional provisions are not working and will not work.
- When government tries an activity that does not work it should be changed or eliminated. Continuation of the Commission and the reaction to its recommendations only serve to bring state government into disrepute with Missourians. It is unfair to our citizens and the members of the Commission who take time out of their lives to serve the state to continue this process as currently constituted.

APPENDIX G SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

MISSOURI CITIZEN'S COMMISSION ON COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

MEETINGS

The Missouri Citizen's Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials was organized under the provisions of Article XIII Section 3 of the Constitution of Missouri. The Commission met to complete the second phase of its four-year term. The Commission includes the following members at the time of this report.

<u>Name</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Appointed by</u>
John Ebeling, Chair	Manchester	Governor
Margaret J. May, Vice-Chair	Kansas City	Governor
Larry Barnhart	Long Lane	Secretary of State -- random selection for 4 th Congressional district
Laura Brenton	Independence	Secretary of State -- random selection for 5 th Congressional district
John Michael Bruno	St. Louis	Secretary of State -- random selection for 3 rd Congressional district
Maureen Buscher	Warrenton	Governor
Phillip Caltagirone	Fenton	Secretary of State -- random selection for 1 st Congressional district
Terry Cross	Hollister	Secretary of State -- random selection for 7 th Congressional district
J. Joseph Dahlem	St. Louis	Secretary of State -- random selection for 2 nd Congressional district
Kevin Dailey	Mercer	Secretary of State -- random selection for 6 th Congressional district
Jean Dudgeon	Kirksville	Governor
Sue Grigsby	West Plains	Secretary of State -- random selection for 8 th Congressional district
Barry Guier	Sweet Springs	Governor
James Hill	Ellington	Governor
Yetta Kilgore	St. Louis	Governor
Phyllis Woolen Markus	St. Louis	Governor
Robert Mueller	St. Louis	Governor
James A. Pudlowski	St. Louis	Supreme Court en banc
Phillip Ryan	Hannibal	Secretary of State -- random selection for 9 th Congressional district
Rhonda Stafford	Cassville	Governor

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G-7

The Commission held a total of four public hearings and a final meeting to complete its recommendations. The meetings helped the Commission understand its mandate and fulfill its mission to create a schedule of compensation in accordance with the state's constitution. The meetings included:

October 3, 2002 – Kansas City – Organizational meeting and public hearing

During the organizational meeting the Commission discussed the outcome of its recommendations from two years ago. The Commission discussed the budget shortfalls the state has experienced. In addition, some preliminary discussion took place on the effect on salaries of health care cost increases faced by state employees over the same time period. The Commission also heard an update on the work on salaries and benefits by the state's Personnel Advisory Board and the Missouri Commission on Total Compensation appointed by Governor Holden. The Commission discussed the ground rules for presentation at the public hearings.

At the public hearing the Commission heard testimony from an Associate Circuit Court Judge about the work load carried by associate circuit court judges throughout the state. He explained how he is assigned cases outside of his county and how this happens throughout the state for judges in the system. Given the workload, the Commission asked about changing to a one tier trial court system by converting associate circuit court judges to circuit court judges. The Commission heard testimony about the role of each level of the judiciary. It was noted that the gap between the various judicial levels had grown over the years due to percentage increases in salaries being adopted by the legislature. He brought to the Commission a plan to close the gap. Appellate judges would be paid 95%, circuit judges 90%, and associate circuit judges 90% less \$5,000 of Supreme Court judge salaries.

October 17, 2002 – Cape Girardeau – Public hearing

The Commission heard public testimony from several associate circuit court judges and a retired judge. The Commission heard testimony about the importance of having a well qualified judiciary. The Commission heard testimony about how the two tier trial court system was adopted. In areas of the state where judges have to run for election, the disparity between associate circuit judges who must run for election every four years was compared to circuit court judges who have to run every six years instead. The Commission heard testimony about the importance of the associate circuit court judges to the trial court system. Given the workload the Commission asked about changing to a one tier trial court system by converting associate circuit court judges to circuit court judges. In addition, the system of assigning judges both within and outside their home counties was explored at length. Testimony also highlighted the fact that circuit judges have court reporters compared to associate circuit court judges who receive only recording equipment. The Commission heard about how percentage pay increases have widened the pay differential between the various levels of the judiciary. According to testimony, the widening disparity in salaries creates significant animosity and frustration among the judges given the similarity in the associate circuit and circuit court workloads. The disparity in salaries then carries over to retirement benefits that are based on salaries thus furthering the frustration. A plan to close the gap was proposed. The plan would establish the Supreme Court salaries. Appellate judges would be paid \$5,000 less, circuit court judges \$10,000 less, and associate circuit court judges \$15,000 less than the Supreme Court judges.

October 24, 2002 – Springfield – Public hearing

The Commission heard testimony from an associate circuit court judge. The Commission heard testimony about the importance of the associate circuit court judges to the trial court system. In addition, the system of assigning judges both within and outside their home counties was explored. The Commission heard about how percentage pay increases had widened the pay differential between the various levels of the judiciary. The current salaries do not reflect the proper value of the workload of the associate circuit court judges. The disparity in salaries then carries over to retirement benefits that are based on salaries thus furthering the frustration. Given the workload the possibility of changing to a one tier trial court system by converting associate circuit court judges to circuit court judges was discussed. A plan to close the salary gap was proposed. The plan would establish the Supreme Court salaries. Appellate judges would be paid \$5,000 less, circuit court judges \$10,000 less, and associate circuit court judges \$15,000 less than the Supreme

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

Court judges. The impact on salaries of the substantial increases in employee health care premiums was explained. Those cost increases have resulted in net pay reductions for judges and other state employees.

November 7, 2002 – St. Louis – Public hearing

The Commission heard public testimony from members of the public, a Supreme Court judge, an ex-Appeals Court judge, other state judges, and a state senator. A witness, who was a state employee, suggested that members of the legislature should not receive a pay increase because they have failed to adequately address the problems of the state in many areas – state employee salaries and the effect of large health care cost increases, workload increases, turnover, and the budget cuts on those less fortunate and on higher education.

The Commission heard testimony about the importance of having a well qualified judiciary. Testimony was presented that law school graduates are being hired by large law firms at starting salaries of between \$70,000 and \$90,000 per year. According to the Missouri Bar economic survey, the average net income of lawyers in Missouri is \$145,000 – or \$22,000 more than is paid to Supreme Court justices. It was pointed out that the Missouri bar discounts its rates for dues and continuing education credits to judges because of the substantial differential between public and private salaries. While judges expect that their public service will be rewarded at a lower salary, the difference is becoming too great a sacrifice. This results in economic factors forcing judges to leave the system. Of as great importance is the fact that highly qualified lawyers do not consider becoming judges because of the great disparity in pay between judicial and private sector salaries.

The Commission heard extensive testimony about the workload of the associate circuit court judges and the circuit court judges. The importance of the associate circuit court judges to the trial court system was highlighted. The possibility of changing to a one tier trial court system by converting associate circuit court judges to circuit court judges was discussed. In addition, the system of assigning judges both within and outside their home counties was explored at length.

The Commission heard about how percentage pay increases had widened the pay differential between the various levels of the judiciary. The widening disparity in salaries creates significant animosity and frustration among the judges according to testimony about the similarity in the associate circuit and circuit court workloads. The disparity in salaries then carries over to retirement benefits that are based on salaries thus furthering the frustration. A plan to close the gap was proposed. The plan would establish the Supreme Court salaries. Appellate judges would be paid \$5,000 less, circuit court judges \$10,000 less, and associate circuit court judges \$15,000 less than the Supreme Court judges. In addition, the Commission heard testimony that encouraged it to recommend salary increases to catch up for the two lost years where no pay plan was provided for judges.

Sen. Goode suggested that the Commission recommend no pay raise for elected officials, the judiciary, or the legislature because of the severe budget situation facing the state. In addition, he argued that there are always more than sufficient high quality candidates seeking judgeships when they become available. He also questioned whether the workload of rural county associate circuit court judges justified higher salaries. Several judges testified that because of the growing complexity of cases, the increasing workload, and the system of assigning judges outside their jurisdictions that the workload justified higher salaries.

November 15, 2000 – Jefferson City – Final compensation schedule established

The Commission met to finalize the compensation schedule that would be delivered in accordance with Article XIII Section 3 of the Missouri Constitution.

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G - 9

Compensation Schedule

Per Diem Expense Allowances:

Legislation was passed several years ago that provides that the General Assembly receive a rate not to exceed 80 percent of the federal per diem for Jefferson City. That rate is adjusted annually. The Commission believes that this rate is appropriate. The Commission's compensation schedule provides that the rate continue to be set at 80 percent of the federal per diem for Jefferson City.

The Commission did not receive any testimony about the per diem mandated by Section 476.380 RSMo for attendance at the annual Judicial Conference. During the 1999 legislative session a bill was passed that requires the state to pay a judge's actual and necessary expenses. Barring any testimony, the Commission's compensation schedule maintains the current practice.

Mileage Allowances:

The state mileage allowance is set at three cents less than the federal rate. Currently, the state rate is 33.5 cents per mile and is adjusted annually. The Commission's compensation schedule maintains the three cent differential.

Salary Rates:

The Commission must establish a schedule of salaries for the statewide elected officials, the General Assembly, and various levels of the Judiciary - from an Associate Circuit Court Judge to a Supreme Court Judge. In doing so, we are mindful of the fact that the adjustments to any of the salaries covered by the Commission have a cost to Missouri taxpayers. However, the full cost of the salaries paid to the positions covered by the Commission is very small in terms of the state budget - just six-tenths of one percent of the general revenue budget in Fiscal Year 2003. The Commission also acknowledges that the individuals holding these positions are given the responsibility to lead our state government and make decisions affecting all Missourians. These positions lead our state in providing for education, public safety, health care, and many other critical functions for Missourians. The Commission also believes that appropriate salaries are necessary to recruit a diverse, cross section of Missouri's citizens to fill these challenging jobs. Accordingly, in setting a schedule of salaries for these positions for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005 the Commission has striven to achieve a middle ground that is evenhanded in its treatment of individuals holding these positions while best serving the requirements of and maximizing the benefits to the Missouri citizenry.

General Salary Adjustment

The Commission recognizes that there are other entities making pay increase recommendations for state employees to the Governor and General Assembly. The Personnel Advisory Board and the Missouri Commission on Total Compensation have worked cooperatively in past years to develop a consistent approach to pay increases across all state agencies for all state employees. The Commission recognizes that this effort had been quite successful in addressing compensation issues until the budget problems of the past two years prevented salary increases for Fiscal Year 2002 and Fiscal Year 2003. The Commission reviewed the pay increase recommendations for Fiscal Year 2004 made by the Personnel Advisory Board and the Missouri Commission on Total Compensation. The general recommendations applicable to all state employees include:

- 3.8 percent for a general structure adjustment. This adjustment reflects an average of several indexes used by the state to estimate inflation, the cost of living, and what other employers expect in terms of wage increases.
- One or two within grade steps to adjust salaries to the marketplace. This adjustment is recommended by the Personnel Advisory Board and the Missouri Commission on Total Compensation as a means of gradually bringing state employees up to the market rate paid by other employers. Each step averages about two percent for state employees.

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

The Commission, after careful consideration, approved a compensation schedule that provides for a 5.8 percent increase for both Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005 for statewide elected officials and the General Assembly – 3.8 percent for a general structure adjustment and 2.0 percent equivalent to one within grade step. The Commission's compensation schedule is not intended to be added on top of any other general, uniform increase given to other state employees. Nor does the Commission intend that any general, uniform increase be added on top of the compensation schedule.

Health Care Costs

A number of witnesses told the Commission about the substantial increases in the cost of health care on state employees over the past several years. With multi-year increases in health care ranging well into the double-digits at the same time that salaries have been frozen, state employees, and the groups covered by our review, have in reality suffered net pay cuts. The Missouri Commission on Total Compensation also has reviewed this issue and recommends full funding of budget requests for any increase in health care costs in Fiscal Year 2004. The Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials is quite concerned that health care cost increases undermine any salary adjustments it recommends and supports full funding of those increases as well.

Judicial Salaries

The Commission must set the salaries for the various levels of the Judiciary - from an Associate Circuit Court Judge to a Supreme Court Judge. The Commission heard testimony about the fact that the judicial system competes in the marketplace for talented judges. We learned that law firms in Missouri are hiring top young lawyers right out of law school at salaries between \$70,000 and \$90,000. The testimony provided to the Commission emphasized that judges expect lower salaries for public service. However, the Commission heard in its public hearings that the degree of disparity is a major consideration for a person considering a decision to become a judge. The testimony indicated that the difference between the salary that a lawyer can make in private practice and a judge's salary cannot be too great without affecting the quality of those seeking judgeships. The Commission believes that it is essential that high quality individuals with experience be recruited to be judges. Otherwise, the quality of justice for Missourians will suffer.

The Missouri citizenry must have a judicial system of which they can be proud. Justice is best served with a judiciary with the ability to know the law, analyze the law, and apply it fairly and consistently. Judges set the tone for a model of excellence among the practicing bar. High judicial standards raise the level of the entire legal system as lawyers practicing before the bar perform at a high level. Thus, the entire system of justice, clients, and citizens harvest the benefits. Judges must possess compassion, understanding, and the common sense necessary to provide a sound judicial decision. To recruit and retain such persons requires fair compensation.

The Commission recognizes the importance of the Judiciary and recommends a \$6,000 increase in the base salary for both Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005.

Supreme Court

The Commission also recognizes the additional service to Missouri provided by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Commission's compensation schedule provides an additional \$2,500 in compensation for both Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005 as is current practice.

APPENDIX G
SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

G - 11

General Assembly

The Commission recognizes that the duties of a legislator are difficult, time consuming, and far outweigh the length of service generally associated with being in session. Legislators make a substantial commitment to address constituent's needs at all hours of the day and over the course of the entire year. We also recognize that these duties vary considerably amongst legislators with periodic peaks and valleys.

For Fiscal Year 2004 and Fiscal Year 2005, the Commission's compensation schedule provides for a continuation of the additional compensation given the seven traditional leadership positions in the legislature (Speaker of the House, President Pro Tem of the Senate, Speaker Pro Tem of the House, Majority Floor Leader of the House, Majority Floor Leader of the Senate, Minority Floor Leader the House, and Minority Floor Leader of the Senate).

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

The Future of the Commission

The members of the Commission worked very hard this year and in 2000 to meet the obligations established in the state constitution and entrusted to us by Missouri's voters. When a member accepts an appointment, whether it is from the Secretary of State, the Supreme Court, or the Governor, a commitment is established to spend the time necessary to participate in the process and deliver thoughtful, sensible recommendations. For two years members take time from their own jobs and personal lives to travel across the state to attend public hearings and other meetings of the Commission. Members review data, information, and testimony gathered at the public hearings. Members direct the Office of Administration to conduct research into salary and benefit issues. Due to the volunteer efforts of the members all of this takes place and a report is delivered for about \$20,000.

The current Commission delivered what it considers to be reasonable and appropriate recommendations this year and in 2000. The recommendations of the Commission were ignored and criticized in 1996, 1998, and 2000. Members of the Commission recognize that this year's recommendations may receive the same fate. If that is the case then it is clear that the current constitutional provisions are not working and will not work. The Commission recommends that the General Assembly either:

- a. Change the structure of the Commission so that the recommendations are binding upon the General Assembly and stand appropriated, or
- c. Abolish the Commission.

Members of the Commission do not believe that in 1994 Missouri's voters approved creation of the Citizen's Commission on Compensation on Elected Officials expecting that it would fail to achieve its purposes. Nor do the members believe that the voters expect the political wrangling over the Commission's recommendations to permanently prevent statewide elected officials, and members of the Judiciary and General Assembly from ever receiving any salary increase. However, the existence of the Commission and its recommendations have been used to foment antipathy for salary increases. The members of the Commission believe that some method of providing regular salary increases for statewide elected officials, the Judiciary, and the General Assembly is necessary to ensure that a diverse, high-quality group of individuals is willing to take these important jobs. Decisions by the individuals holding these positions affect every Missourian.

We believe that the voters should be given the opportunity to make changes to, or abolish, the Commission at the general election in August 2004. If the Commission is not abolished until November 2004 the Secretary of State, Governor, and the Supreme Court will have to start the process again in two years to enable the Commission to complete its public hearings and submit its recommendations by December 1 in accordance with the current constitutional provisions.

When government tries an activity that does not work it should be eliminated. Continuation of the Commission and the reaction to its recommendations only serve to bring state government into disrepute with Missourians. It is unfair to our citizens and the members of the Commission who take time out of their lives to serve the state to continue this process.

APPENDIX G **SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION**

G - 13

MISSOURI CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON COMPENSATION FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS **COMPENSATION SCHEDULE**

<u>Official</u>	<u>Current Salary</u>	<u>Recommended Change FY 2004</u>	<u>Leadership Differential</u>	<u>New Salary FY 2004</u>	<u>Recommended Change FY 2005</u>	<u>Leadership Differential</u>	<u>New Salary FY 2005</u>
<u>Statewide Elected Officials</u>							
Governor	120,087	6,965	0	127,052	7,369	0	134,421
LI Governor	77,184	4,477	0	81,661	4,736	0	86,397
Secretary of State	96,455	5,594	0	102,049	5,919	0	107,968
State Auditor	96,455	5,594	0	102,049	5,919	0	107,968
State Treasurer	96,455	5,584	0	102,049	5,919	0	107,968
Attorney General	104,332	6,051	0	110,383	6,402	0	116,785
<u>Judiciary</u>							
Supreme Court - Chief Justice	123,000	6,000	2,500	131,500	6,000	2,500	140,000
Supreme Court Justice	123,000	6,000	0	129,000	6,000	0	135,000
Court of Appeals Judge	115,000	6,000	0	121,000	6,000	0	127,000
Circuit Court Judge	108,000	6,000	0	114,000	6,000	0	120,000
Associate Circuit Court Judge	96,000	6,000	0	102,000	6,000	0	108,000
<u>General Assembly**</u>							
Senator	31,351	1,818	0	33,169	1,924	0	35,093
Representative	31,351	1,818	0	33,169	1,924	0	35,093
Speaker of the House	31,351	1,818	2,500	35,669	1,924	2,500	40,093
President Pro Tem of the Senate	31,351	1,818	2,500	35,669	1,924	2,500	40,093
Majority floor leader of the House	31,351	1,818	1,500	34,669	1,924	1,500	38,093
Minority floor leader of the Senate	31,351	1,818	1,500	34,669	1,924	1,500	38,093
Minority floor leader of the House	31,351	1,818	1,500	34,669	1,924	1,500	38,093
Minority floor leader of the Senate	31,351	1,818	1,500	34,669	1,924	1,500	38,093

* Mileage for all positions is to be indexed to the prevailing State of Missouri - Office of Administration rate.

** Per diem is to be indexed at 80 percent of the federal per diem in Jefferson City.

APPENDIX G

SCHEDULE OF COMPENSATION

MISSOURI STATE CONSTITUTION – PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ARTICLE XIII, SECTION 3

1. Other provisions of this constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, in order to ensure that the power to control the rate of compensation of elected officials of this state is retained and exercised by the tax paying citizens of the state, after the effective date of this section no elected state official, member of the general assembly, or judge, except municipal judges, shall receive compensation for the performance of their duties other than in the amount established for each office by the Missouri citizen's commission on compensation for elected officials established pursuant to the provisions of this section. The term "compensation" includes the salary rate established by law, mileage allowances, per diem expense allowances.
2. There is created a commission to be known as the "Missouri Citizen's Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials". The Commission shall be selected in the following manner:
 - (1) One member of the commission shall be selected at random by the secretary of state from each congressional district from among those registered voters eligible to vote at the time of selection. The secretary of state shall establish policies and procedures for conducting the selection at random. In making the selections, the secretary of state shall establish a selection system to ensure that no more than five of the members shall be from the same political party. The policies shall include, but not be limited to, the method of notifying persons selected and for providing for a new selection if any person declines appointment to the commission;
 - (2) One member shall be a retired judge appointed by the judges of the supreme court, en banc;
 - (3) Twelve members shall be appointed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate. Not more than six of the appointees shall be members of the same political party. Of the persons appointed by the governor, one shall be a person who has had experience in the field of personnel management, one shall be a person who is representative of organized labor, one shall be a person representing small business in this state, one shall be the chief executive officer of a business doing an average gross annual business in excess of one million dollars, one shall be a person representing the health care industry, one shall be a person representing agriculture, two shall be persons over the age of sixty years, four shall be citizens of a county of the third classification, two of such citizens selected from a county of the third classification shall be selected from north of the Missouri River and two shall be selected from south of the Missouri River. No two persons selected to represent a county of the third classification shall be from the same county nor shall such persons be appointed from any county represented by an appointment to the commission by the secretary of state pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection.
3. All members of the commission shall be residents and registered voters of the state of Missouri. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, no state official, no member of the general assembly, no active judge of any court, no employee of the state or any of its institutions, boards, commissions, agencies or other entities, no elected or appointed official or employee of any political subdivision of the state, and no lobbyist as defined by law shall serve as a member of the commission. No immediate family member of any person ineligible for service on the commission under the provisions of this subsection may serve on the commission. The phrase "immediate family" means the parents, spouse, siblings, children, or dependant relative of the person whether or not living in the same household.